



Framing a theory-grounded research agenda related to faculty

Julie Hatcher, Executive Director, Center for Service and Learning, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis [jhatcher@iupui.edu]

Patti H. Clayton, Consultant and Practitioner-Scholar, PHC Ventures; Senior Scholar, Center for Service and Learning, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis; Visiting Scholar, University of North Carolina at Greensboro [patti.clayton@curriculumengagement.com]

Lisa McGuire, Associate Professor, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis [lmcguir@iupui.edu]

Mary F. Price, Service Learning Specialist, Center for Service and Learning, Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis [price6@iupui.edu]

Keywords: Research agenda, theory, faculty development, faculty learning, transformative learning

Conference track: Faculty

Format: Symposium

Summary

This symposium is one of five sessions in a series on framing a research agenda in multiple arenas: students, faculty, institutions, communities, and partnerships. Drawing on *Research on Service*

Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment (Clayton, Bringle, & Hatcher, 2013), we will discuss theories relevant to research related to faculty (specifically, faculty development and faculty learning), critique previous research in this arena, and collaboratively generate recommendations for practice and future research.

We will open the session by inviting collaborative critique of research related to faculty. Hatcher will share a model for conceptualizing research in terms of the convergence of theory, design, practice, and measurement (Bringle, Clayton, & Hatcher, in press) and will facilitate discussion of her colleagues' work accordingly. Discussion will focus on two related topics:

(a) Faculty development - Given the central role of faculty in implementing service learning and its unfamiliar (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002), counternormative nature (Clayton & Ash, 2004; Howard, 2000), when faculty development is nonexistent, haphazard, or based on faulty assumptions, strong implementation of service learning courses is not likely. Intentional faculty development, therefore, is an important focus of practice and research. Studies of faculty development have used informal methods, such as satisfaction questionnaires, or have not used authentic evidence of faculty growth to understand the processes that facilitate it. Theory-based studies of faculty development strategies in service learning will help build a knowledge base that can positively influence practice. A research agenda framed by theories related to faculty development will be outlined.

(b) Faculty learning - One of the many counternormative implications of service learning is that it calls into question whose learning is at stake and provides an answer that is broader, deeper, and more integrated than the academy's characteristic focus on student learning - an answer that also highlights the ways that student learning is bound up in the learning of faculty and community members. Service learning can confront faculty with learning opportunities and challenges. Building our capacity to assess and investigate that learning will advance understanding of the conditions under which faculty learn, which can inform institutional engagement initiatives and faculty development. A research agenda framed by theories related to faculty identity, learning, co-learning will be outlined.

References

- Abes, E. S., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. R. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9(1), 5–17.
- Baldwin, R. G. (1996). Faculty career stages and implications for professional development. In D. E. Finnegan, D. Webster, & Z. F. Gamson (Eds.), *Faculty and faculty issues in colleges and universities* (pp. 551–561). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2012). Building learning partnerships. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 44(1), 32–38.
- Bland, C., & Bergquist, W. (1997). The vitality of senior faculty members: Snow on the roof - fire in the furnace. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 25(7). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bringle, R. G. (2003). Enhancing theory-based research on service-learning. In S. H. Billig & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning: Research exploring context, participation, and impacts* (pp. 3–21). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P. H., & Hatcher, J. A. (in press). Research on service learning: An introduction. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher, (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*. (Vol. 2A & 2B). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Meaningful measurement of theory-based service-learning outcomes: Making the case with quantitative research [Special issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall*, 68–75.

Carracelas-Juncal, C., Bossaller, J., & Yaoyuneyong, G. (2009). Integrating service-learning pedagogy: A faculty reflective process. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, 4, 28–44.

Chism, N. (2004). Using a framework to engage faculty in instructional technologies. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, 27(2), 39–45.

Chism, N. (2005). Evaluating approaches to faculty development in the use of learning technologies. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 20(1), 31–36.

Chism, N., Palmer, M., & Price, M. (in press). Investigating faculty development for service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*. (Vol. 2A). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Clayton, P. H., & Ash, S. L. (2004). Shifts in perspective: Capitalizing on the counter-normative nature of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(1), 59-70.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (Eds.). (in press). *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment* (Vol. 2A & 2B). In R. G. Bringle & J. A. Hatcher (Series Eds.), *IUPUI Series on Service Learning Research*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Clayton, P. H., Hess, G. R., Jaeger, A. J., Jameson, J. K., & McGuire, L. E. (in press). Theoretical perspectives and research on faculty learning in service learning. In P. H. Clayton, R. G. Bringle, & J. A. Hatcher (Eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*. (Vol. 2A). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Clayton, P. H., & O'Steen, W. L. (2010). Working with faculty: Designing customized developmental strategies. In B. Jacoby & P. Mutascio (Eds.), *Looking in – reaching out: A reflective guide for community service-learning professionals* (pp. 95–135). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Creamer, E. G., & Lattuca, L. R. (Eds.). (2005). Advancing faculty learning through interdisciplinary collaboration [Special issue]. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 205(102).

Driscoll, A. (2000). Studying faculty and service learning: Directions for inquiry and development [Special issue]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, Fall*, 35–41.

Howard, J. (2000). Academic service learning: Myths, challenges and recommendations. *Essays on Teaching Excellence*, 12(3), 12–19.

Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (2011). Community engaged scholarship as mutually transformative partnerships. In L. Harter, J. Hamel-Lambert, & J. Millesen (Eds.), *Participatory partnerships for social action and research* (pp. 259–277). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

- Jameson, J. K., Clayton, P. H., Jaeger, A. J., & Bringle, R. G. (2012). Investigating faculty learning in the context of community-engaged scholarship. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(2), 40–55.
- Kecskes, K. J., Gelmon, S. B., & Spring, A. (2006). Creating engaged departments: A program for organizational and faculty development. In S. Chadwick-Blossey & D. R. Robertson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (Vol. 24, pp. 147–165). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lattuca, L. R. (2005). Faculty work as learning: Insights from theories of cognition. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2005(102), 13–21.
- Lattuca, L. R., & Creamer, E. G. (2005). Learning as professional practice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2005(102), 3–11.
- McGuire, L., Strong, D., Lay, K., Ardemagni, E., Wittberg, P., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). A case study of faculty learning around reflection: A collaborative faculty development project. In B. Moely, S. Billig, & B. Holland (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 53–72). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- O'Meara, K., & Terosky, A. L. (2010). Engendering faculty professional growth. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 42(6), 44–51.
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Seldin, P. (2006). Tailoring faculty development programs to faculty career stages. In S. Chadwick-Blossey & D. Robertson (Eds.), *To improve the academy: Resources for faculty, instructional, and organizational development* (Vol. 24, pp. 137–146). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Sharp, R. (2004). How do professionals learn and develop? Implications for staff and educational developers. In D. Baume & P. Kahn (Eds.), *Enhancing staff and educational development* (pp. 134–153). London, UK: Routledge Falmer.
- Steinberg, K. S., Bringle, R. G., & Williams, M. J. (2010). *Service learning research primer*. Scotts Valley, CA: National Service-Learning Clearinghouse.